UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Dennis Mowrey,	Civil Action No.:
Plaintiff, v.	
Oxford Law, LLC; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	COMPLAINT
Defendants.	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Dennis Mowrey, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

- 4. The Plaintiff, Dennis Mowrey ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 5. The Defendant, Oxford Law, LLC ("Oxford"), is a Pennsylvania business entity with an address of 311 Veterans Highway, Suite 100A, Levittown, Pennsylvania 19056,

operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by Oxford and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
 - 7. Oxford at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Oxford for collection, or Oxford was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Oxford Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 12. Beginning on or around January 14, 2013, Defendants started contacting Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt by placing calls daily to Plaintiff's cellular and residential telephones.
- 13. During each phone call, Defendants failed to properly identify the name of its company.

- 14. Defendants also failed to clearly inform Plaintiff as to whom the Debt was owed and the amount of the Debt owed.
- 15. On several occasions, Plaintiff requested that Defendants send written validation of the Debt.
- 16. Plaintiff also repeatedly requested that Defendants cease all telephone calls until such validation was provided.
- 17. Despite this request, Defendant continued to hound Plaintiff with telephone calls in its attempt to collect the Debt.
- 18. Moreover, to date, Defendants failed to send Plaintiff written validation of the Debt as required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 19. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.
- 20. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

- 21. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.
- 24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.
- 25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendants used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2) in that Defendants misrepresented the character and amount of the debt.
- 27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.
- 28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
- 29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) in that Defendants failed to send Plaintiff an initial letter within five days of its initial contact with Plaintiff as required by law.
- 30. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
 - 31. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR CREDIT EXTENSION</u> <u>UNIFORMITY ACT, 73 P.S. § 2270, et seq.</u>

- 32. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
 - 33. The Plaintiff is a "consumer," as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 34. The Defendants are each individually a "debt collector" as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 35. The Defendants violated provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., which constitutes an unfair or deceptive practice under 73 P.S. § 2270.4(a).
 - 36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III

VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW, 73 P.S. § 201-1, et seq.

- 37. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 38. The Defendants' violations of the Pennsylvania Fair Credit Extension Uniformity

 Act constitute per se violations under the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer

 Protection Law.
- 39. The Defendants' acts were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law.
- 40. As a result of the Defendants' violations, the Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses entitling the Plaintiff to actual, statutory and treble damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
- 3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) and 73 P.S. § 2270.5 against the Defendants;
- 4. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 2270.5(c);
- 5. Actual damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 6. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 7. Treble damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 8. Actual damages from the Defendants for all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
- 9. Punitive damages; and
- 10. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: February 21, 2013

Respectfully submitted,
By /s/ Jody B. Burton
Jody B. Burton, Esq.
Bar No.: 71681
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424 Attorneys for Plaintiff